1B100

000035992

ENGINEERING-SCIENCE, INC. a unit of
PARSONS ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC.
1700 Broadway, Suite 900 Denver, Colorado 80290
phone: (303) 831-8100 • telecopy (303) 831-8208

MEETING NOTES

TO: Distribution **DATE:** July 12, 1994

FROM: Philip Nixon **PROJECT:** Solar Pond IM/IRA

MEMO #: SP307:071294.02

ATTENDANCE:

Phil Nixon
Andy Ledford, EG&G
Mark Austin, EG&G
Harlen Ainscough, CDH
Arturo Duran, EPA
John Haasbeek, ERM
Tom Peters, PRC
Peg Witherill, SAIC/DOE
Lee Pivonka, G&M

DISTRIBUTION:

Randy Ogg, EG&G
Michelle McKee, EG&G
K. London, EG&G
Steve Keith, EG&G
Steve Paris, EG&G
Steve Cooke, EG&G
Toni Moore, EG&G
R. Popish EG&G (Admin. Record) (2)
Bob Siegrist, LATO
Alan McGregor, ERM
Jesse Roberson, DOE
Helen Belencan, DOE
Scott Surovchak, DOE
Frazer Lockhart, DOE
Steve Howard, DOE/SMS
Joe Schieffelin, CDH
Shaleigh Whitesell, PRC
Marcia Dibiasi, IGO
L. Benson
W. Barnard
P. Breen

A. Conklin
B. Cropper
K. Cutter
W. Edmonson
T. Evans
A. Fricke
H. Heidkamp
R. Henry
M. Hill
P. Holland
S. Hughes
R. McConn
C. Montes
D. Myers
A. Putinsky
R. Stegen
S. Stenseng
R. Schmiermund
S. Winston
B. Glenn
R. Wilkinson
T. Kuykendall
Central Files

SUBJECT: Weekly Status Meeting

(I:\PROJECTS\722446\CORRESP\07129402.WPF\07/13/94)

This meeting called as a result of the agreements made in the dispute resolution which occurred on July 7, 1994. The dispute resolution granted DOE the requested schedule extension to evaluate the feasibility to disposition sludge within the IM/IRA in addition to re-evaluating the technical decisions that have been made on the project to establish the current design baseline. Eleven technical issues were identified during the dispute resolution for evaluation. The working group has a 4 week period to assess and resolve as many of the eleven issues as possible (noting that some issues contingent upon field work or detailed design may not be available in the 4 week period.) The team meetings held in response to the dispute resolution will be conducted differently than the previous working group meetings. The primary parties who will speak during the meeting will be DOE, CDH, and EPA. EG&G and its subcontractors will listen to the discussions and provide information upon request.

DOE was absent from the meeting. The CDH and EPA noted that it was important for DOE to attend these meetings, and that no further meetings would be conducted unless all three parties were in attendance. In addition, Harlen Ainscough noted that the dispute resolution should be formally finalized prior to the next meeting. He remarked that the dispute resolution agreement was not formalized by the appropriate signatures because the wording was still being negotiated. One point of contention is that DOE had written the letter indicating that unresolved issues remaining after the 4 week resolution period would be routed to the Dispute Resolution Committee (DRC). Arturo Duran questioned whether issues could be routed to the DRC until it was evident that an IAG milestone was in jeopardy of being missed. The goal of the working group is to resolve the issues as much as possible so that the DRC will not need to resolve issues but rather to help implement the decisions and recommendations of the working group.

It is generally agreed by the EPA and CDH that the scope of the 4 week evaluation period is to evaluate the feasibility of including sludge in the IM/IRA and to re-evaluate key decisions that were made to establish the current design baseline to ensure that the decisions made were appropriate. This will likely require a review of technical data and modeling results for the specific waste streams proposed for disposition beneath the engineered cover. Key areas of concern and data that will be re-evaluated include:

1) EPA is concerned that there is a disconnect in the IM/IRA-EA Decision Document in that the 1000 year engineered cover will function to significantly reduce the amount of infiltration but that infiltrating precipitation as shown in modeling results will not cause contaminants to leach at concentrations that exceed the ground water comparison criteria. Based on this concern the HELP, VLEACH, and MYGRT modeling under unsaturated conditions will be re-evaluated to assess the applicability of the results to justify the need for the 1000 year engineered cover design. Phil Nixon indicated that a conservative cover design was intentionally selected because not all the hazardous wastes identified

for disposition beneath the engineered cover would be characterized so their concentrations would not be known and the models would not be run for these wastes (utilities, sandbags, soils and liners beneath SEP 207-C and SEP 207-B South). Phil Nixon indicated that some of these wastes could not be sampled and analyzed until the IM/IRA was being implemented and then it would be too late to model and determine if it could be dispositioned beneath the engineered cover. In addition the time to perform the sampling/analysis (on those waste materials that could be sampled) would have a negative impact on the start of construction date, and the costs of the analysis would be very close to equalling the cost savings from constructing a less conservative engineered cover. It was discussed that perhaps a RCRA-compliant engineered cover could be designed without requiring that all hazardous wastes be analyzed prior to disposition beneath the RCRA-compliant engineered cover. It was agreed that this issue would be re-evaluated. ES needs to re-examine whether the HELP/VLEACH/MYGRT modeling was performed for the RCRA-compliant engineered cover.

2) CDH is concerned that the incorporation of all the various waste streams beneath the engineered cover has caused the footprint of the engineered cover to exceed the appropriate limits for the constraints associated with the OU4 site. A specific concern entails the potential instability of the northern hillside. It was agreed that the geotechnical analysis should be expedited. It was also acknowledged that the results of the geotechnical analysis would not be available within the 4 week resolution period. It was agreed that the wastes proposed for disposition would be prioritized and the impact of these materials would be assessed with respect to their impact on the side slope, height, and stability of the engineered cover. Harlen Ainscough indicated that the prioritization should focus on the wastes that should be addressed during closure of the OU4 as opposed to overall waste management prioritization at the RFP. It is acknowledged that approximately 87% of the consolidated material is vadose zone soils beneath the IHSS 101. Therefore, the decision to excavate these soils will be re-evaluated. The saturated VLEACH/MYGRT modeling will be re-evaluated and revised Kd values may be incorporated (data from OU2 soil washing studies may provide relevant data). In addition the decision to excavate for the purpose of remediating the Nitrate release will be re-considered.

3) EPA is concerned that they have not been presented with a cost estimate for the sludge disposition beneath the engineered cover in comparison to offsite disposal. This information will be incorporated into the feasibility study for sludge disposition. EPA indicated that the cost estimate level of detail should be similar to what is in the IM/IRA EA Decision Document. EPA is satisfied with the

direct costs associated with the IM/IRA estimates but would like information concerning the roll-up factors used to determine the construction support and administrative activities. Mark Austin indicated that the roll-up factors are standard percentages based on the EG&G historical project database. Therefore, it is unlikely that these numbers will change.

Arturo Duran proposed an overall resolution strategy that was discussed. It was decided that Arturo Duran and Harlen Ainscough would meet separately to revise the resolution strategy based on the results of the meeting. The revised resolution strategy will be presented and discussed at the next meeting. A tentative meeting was scheduled for Friday, July 15, 1994 at the ES office.

Phil Nixon presented a brief written historical summary of the decisions that have occurred on the project and a summary of the agreements that were made at the team meetings. These were presented to refresh the team members memories with respect to the decisions that were made over the previous years work. In addition ES presented a decision flow diagram that might be used to help the team come to a resolution on specific issues.

Philip A. Nixon